

SN. 10/603,582

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CANO:076

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are now pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

Amendment

A better descriptive title has been given per the examiner's request. Claim 4 has been amended to remove the redundancy identified by the examiner. Further, claims 1 and 7 have been edited to remove the superfluous language "capable of being." Claims 2-6 have been placed in independent form by incorporating original claim 1 to place them in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 1 and 7 also have been amended to more clearly recite the present invention by reciting that the image forming device forms images based on image forming jobs, and that the container receives and stores, or the discharge device discharges, the sheets of different image forming jobs. Further, these claims recite that a controller selectively inhibits storage or formation of a next image forming job according to the priority level of a previous image forming job. New claim 8 has been added to further define the present invention. Claim 8 is similar to claim 1, except that the controller selectively inhibits the storage of a current image forming job according to the priority level of a most recent image forming job stored in the container.

No new matter has been introduced.

Allowable Claims

Claims 2-6 were indicated to be allowable if they are placed in independent form. As these claims have been placed in independent form, they are in condition for allowance. Please note that claim 3 should have depended from claim 1, not claim 2. Claim 3, as presently amended, thus does not incorporate claim 2. Nonetheless, claim 3 is still believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth below.

SN. 10/603,582

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CANO:076

Art Rejection

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Ishii (USP 6,246,926). Applicants submit that the present amendment renders moot this rejection because Ishii does not disclose or teach a controller that selectively inhibits the storage of a next image forming job according to the priority level of a previous image forming job, as set forth in claims 1 and 7, and a controller that selectively inhibits the storage of a current image forming job according to the priority level of a most recent image forming job stored in the container, as set forth in new claim 8.

As presently claimed, the controller selectively inhibits a next or current job in relation to the priority level of the previous or most recent job. Applicants submit that Ishii merely discloses selecting a discharge bin in accordance with the estimated number of sheets to be discharged. But Ishii does not disclose or teach controlling inhibiting of the current or next job in relation to the priority of another job previously made. Accordingly, applicants submit that Ishii would not have anticipated or rendered claims 1, 7, and 8 obvious within the meaning of § 102, § 103.


Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Date: October 4, 2004

ROSSI & ASSOCIATES
P.O. Box 826
Ashburn, VA 20146-0826
Phone: 703-726-6020

Respectfully submitted,


LYLE KIMMS
REG. NO. 34079
RULE 34A
Marc A. Rossi
Registration No. 31,923